

a3
wncf,

18. (Amended) A fence and cutting table as defined by claim 11, further comprising a pair of base blocks, each mounted at an end of the cutting guide; and further comprising:

[wherein the] a locking mechanism includes a clamp bar mounted to one of the base blocks by a tightener [configured to clamp] releasably clamping the remaining base block to the cutting table top.

REMARKS

This application has been reviewed in light of the Official Action. In response, telephone interviews were conducted on March 14, 2000 and March 22, 2000. The first interview on March 14, 2000, was conducted to discuss the 35 USC §112 rejections. A suggested modified claim was discussed with the Examiner and further discussion was made with regard to presentation of amended language. The undersigned offered to submit a new set of claims, canceling the original claims. The Examiner indicated, instead, a preference for an amendment in which the claims are presented in original format with the amended language showing. The Examiner tentatively agreed to favorably consider amended claim language in which the term "configured to" is removed.

The second interview, conducted on March 22, 2000, was an inquiry regarding an inconsistency at page 3 of the Official Action dated December 22, 1999. The Examiner indicated the correct language in the Action should relate to claims 3 and 11 instead of claims "3 or 4" as stated in the Action.

1 In the Official Action, claims 5, 6, 13, 14 and 18 are withdrawn
2 from consideration. These claims remain in the application and action
3 on such claims is respectfully requested should independent parent claims
4 be found allowable upon action on the merits.

5 Referring specifically to the Action and particularly to page 4
6 thereof, the drawings are objected to. Specifically, the Examiner
7 requests that the numeral 31' be added to Fig. 1 to indicate the slots
8 described on page 13, line 9. Substitute drawing sheets indicating
9 inclusion of this reference numeral are provided for approval. Further,
10 in Fig. 2, the rightmost occurrences of 40 and 41 have been changed
11 to 40' and 41' for clarity. Fig. 4 has also been corrected to eliminate
12 the double occurrence of numeral 53. The above changes are submitted
13 in red-line copies of the drawings for Examiner approval. Upon
14 approval of these corrections and upon receiving a Notice of
15 Allowability, Applicant will submit a set of substitute drawings for entry.

16 Various objections to the specification are pointed out at pages 4
17 and 5 of the Official Action. In response, the suggested corrections are
18 incorporated by way of the present Amendment. No new matter is
19 introduced by the corrections. Entry of the corrections and removal of
20 the objections is therefore respectfully requested.

21 At page 5 of the Official Action, various rejections under
22 35 USC §112 are listed.

23 Specifically, numerous claims are rejected under 35 USC §112 as
24 vague and indefinite for inclusion of the term "configured". While there

1 is disagreement as to the use of this term, amendments have been made
2 to the rejected claims to remove the term and place the claims in
3 compliance with the Action.

4 Specifically, the term "configured for attachment", "configured", and
5 "configured to permit" have been removed from claim 1. Additional
6 structural language is also included in the claim to further clarify the
7 structural nature of the claimed fence. Claim 1 is now believed to be
8 in proper form. Withdrawal of the rejection is therefore requested.

9 Claim 2 is rejected for inclusion of "configured to secure" as
10 rendering the claim vague and indefinite. In response, the terms "and
11 configured" have been removed, in compliance with the Action.
12 Removal of the rejection is therefore requested.

13 Claim 3 is rejected under §112. The term "configured to be
14 mounted" is objected to, at lines 2 and 3. In response, this language
15 has been removed. The term "a working flight" at lines 6 and 7 is
16 objected to as vague and indefinite with a suggestion that the
17 specification and drawing should include a clear indication of the
18 working flight. In response, the specification and drawings have been
19 amended, particularly at page 7, line 11, to include the reference
20 numerals 39 and 39' after the word "flights". These reference numerals
21 are also added to the drawings.

22 The language including "in such a manner that... lifted from the
23 chains" is indicated as being vague and indefinite. This language has
24 been removed by this Amendment and definite language relating to the

1 aligning lugs which are now defined as releasably interconnecting the
2 cutting guide and working flights in response to movement of the cutting
3 guide in a direction normal to the working flights. This language is
4 believed to be clear and definite, especially taken in view of the
5 specification and drawings which clearly show exemplary support for the
6 claimed subject matter. Reference is made to Fig. 6 which shows the
7 cutting guide released from the working flights, and Fig. 5 which shows
8 the aligning lugs interconnecting the cutting guide and working flights.

9 The "locking mechanism configured to secure" is also objected to
10 in claim 3. This limitation has been removed.

11 It is believed that claim 3 as presently amended is in compliance
12 with the Official Action and that the rejection under 35 USC §112
13 should be removed.

14 With respect to claim 4, it is stated that "between" renders the
15 claim vague. Further, it is suggested that the word "to" be substituted
16 for the term "between". This has been accomplished by amendment.
17 Further, the term "configured to adjustably position" is deemed to be
18 vague and indefinite. In response, the term "configured" has been
19 removed. Claim 4 is therefore believed to be in compliance and that
20 the rejection under 35 USC §112 should be removed.

21 Claims 5 and 6 have been withdrawn from consideration at this
22 point. However, these claims are believed to be in allowable form and
23 in condition for allowance should parent claim 3 be found allowable in
24 an action on the merits.

1 The Action states that claim 7 is rejected under 35 USC §112.
2 However, no reason for the rejection is found in the Official Action.
3 The claim is believed to be in definite form and removal of the
4 rejection is therefore requested. Should the rejection persist, Applicant
5 requests that reasons be given for the rejection.

6 In claim 8, a suggestion that the language --; and-- should be
7 inserted after "therein". This has been accomplished by amendment.
8 Withdrawal of the rejection of claim 8 under §112 is therefore
9 requested.

10 In claim 9, the term "configured to adjust" is stated to be vague
11 and indefinite. In response, the terms "and configured" at line 8 have
12 been removed. Claim 9 is therefore believed to be in proper form and
13 removal of the rejection is justified.

14 Claim 10 is rejected for inclusion of the term "or" and "configure
15 to selectively shift". Both terms have been removed by amendment.
16 The claim is therefore believed to be in compliance with the action and
17 removal of the rejection is requested.

18 In claim 11, a statement is made that it is not clear as to what
19 recited structure is part of the fence and what structure is part of the
20 cutting table. It is pointed out that in the preamble, the claim is
21 drawn to the combination of a fence and cutting table. The remainder
22 of the claim clearly indicates the respective elements of the combination.
23 It is believed that changing the word "and" to --on a-- would create the
24 very confusion sought to be avoided. Also, the terms "a working flight"

1 are stated to be vague and indefinite. Applicant respectfully disagrees.
2 The working flight is clearly pointed out in the specification and
3 drawings as indicated above. Still further, at lines 21 and 22, the
4 phrase "configured in such a manner that... lifted from the chains" is
5 stated as being vague and indefinite. In response, this phrase has been
6 deleted from the claim and has been replaced with language indicating
7 that the aligning lugs are releasably received within the tooth receiving
8 spaces of the chains responsive to movement of the cutting guide in a
9 direction toward the planar top surface. This language is believed to
10 be clear and definite. The limitation "a locking mechanism" is objected
11 to for inclusion of the term "configured to secure". In response, this
12 restriction has been removed from the claim.

13 The amendments made to claim 11 and explanation given above,
14 are believed to place the claim in proper form and in compliance with
15 the Action. Removal of the rejection is therefore respectfully requested.

16 Claim 12 is rejected under 35 USC §112. The term "between" is
17 stated to render the claim vague and it is suggested that the word "to"
18 be substituted. This has been done by amendment. Further, the terms
19 "configure to selectively position" are deemed to be vague and indefinite.
20 In response, the term "configured" has been removed from the claim.
21 Claim 12 is therefore believed to be in compliance with the action and
22 removal of the rejection is requested.
23
24

1 Claims 13 and 14 have been withdrawn from further consideration.
2 These claims are believed to be in proper form and should be found
3 allowable upon a finding of allowability for parent claim 11.

4 Claims 15 and 16 stand rejected under 35 USC §112. However,
5 there is no explanation within the Action or reasons for the rejection
6 set forth for the rejection. Claims 15 and 16 are believed to be in
7 proper form. The rejection under 35 USC §112 should therefore be
8 removed.

9 Claim 17 is rejected for inclusion of the term "configured to
10 secure". In response, the term "configured" has been removed at both
11 occurrences within the claim. It is also suggested that a comma be
12 placed after the term "chains" on line 6. This has been accomplished
13 by amendment. Further, the term "between" is stated to render the
14 claim vague and it is suggested that the term be changed to --to--.
15 This has been accomplished by amendment. Claim 17 is believed to be
16 in compliance with the Action and the rejection should therefore be
17 removed.

18 Claim 18 does not stand rejected in the Action, but is withdrawn
19 from consideration. However, the claim has been amended to comply
20 with the amended language of parent claim 11, wherein the locking
21 mechanism limitation was removed. Claim 18 is amended to add the
22 locking mechanism as a new element added by dependency to claim 11.
23 In addition, the term "configured to clamp" has been replaced by the
24

1 more definite term --releasably clamping--. Claim 18 is believed to be
2 in proper form.

3 Given the fact that no references are cited in the Action,
4 Applicants assume and believe the claims as now presented are in
5 condition for allowance. Such action is therefor respectfully requested.
6 However, should art be cited in a further Action, Applicants urgently
7 request that such action be made **non-final** in order allow adequate
8 opportunity to consider the references and respond appropriately.

9 An urgent attempt has been made to comply with the Official
10 Action. Should the Examiner have any questions or further suggestions,
11 a telephone interview with the undersigned is invited.

12 Respectfully submitted,

13
14 Dated: 4/18/00

By: James L. Price

James L. Price
Reg. No. 27,376